

1 Hon. James L. Robart
2
3
4
5
6
7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 AUBRY MCMAHON,
9 Plaintiff,

10 v.
11

WORLD VISION, INC.,
12 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:21-cv-00920-JLR

PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
JUNE 16, 2023

13
14 **INTRODUCTION**

15 Plaintiff Aubry McMahon (“Plaintiff”) requests four pre-trial evidentiary rulings by the
16 Court, which are precluding the introduction of any evidence by Defendant related to: (1)
17 Plaintiff engaging in sexual conduct with anyone; (2) Plaintiff’s history of her sexual identity
and the disclosures made to her family as to her sexual orientation; (3) Plaintiff having
18 previously suffered from an eating disorder; and (4) Plaintiff’s activism for LGBTQ rights
including, *inter alia*, her involvement with the Charlotte Area Liberal Moms group (abbreviated
19 CALM), Timeout Youth, or selling homemade items online that contain pro-LGBTQ
20 messaging.

21
22
23 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

24 **A. Statement of Case.**

25 This case is one involving discrimination on the basis of sex, sexual orientation and
26 marital status brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”) and the
27 Washington Law Against Discrimination (“WLAD”), Rev. Code Wash. (“RCW”) § 49.60.

1 Plaintiff, who is a gay woman in a same-sex marriage, contends that Defendant World Vision,
 2 Inc. (“Defendant” or “World Vision”) rescinded its job offer to her for the position of customer
 3 service representative because it learned she was in a same-sex marriage. Defendant took this
 4 action in furtherance of a hiring policy that facially discriminates against individuals with
 5 respect to sex, sexual orientation, and marital status as the policy effectively prohibits the
 6 employment of any individual who is in a same-sex marriage.

7 **Certification.**

8 The parties conferred through counsel on May 18, 22, 24, and 25, 2023, in an effort to
 9 resolve the matters in dispute. Issues upon which no agreement could be reached are addressed
 10 below, as are the facts pertinent to each issue.

11 **LEGAL ARGUMENT**

12 Motions *in limine* arise from “the court’s inherent power to manage the course of trials”
 13 and “exclude anticipated prejudicial or irrelevant evidence before it is actually offered at trial.”
 14 *Luce v. United States*, 469 U.S. 38, 40 n.2, 41 n.4 (1984). Motions *in limine* also promote
 15 “judicial economy” and “save jury time.” *See United States v. Cook*, 608 F.2d 1175, 1186 (9th
 16 Cir. 1979), *overruled on other grounds by Luce*, 469 U.S. at 40, n.3. “A party may bring a
 17 motion *in limine* to obtain a ruling on the admissibility of specific evidence to be *introduced at*
 18 *trial.*” *Nelson v. Paulson*, C08-1034-JCC, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 128803, at *1 (W.D. Wash.
 19 Dec. 15, 2008) (emphasis in original). The trial court has discretion to admit or deny a motion
 20 *in limine*. *See U.S. Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Lee Inv. LLC*, 641 F.3d 1126, 1137 (9th Cir. 2011)
 21 (reviewing district court’s order on motions *in limine* for abuse of discretion).

22 **MOTION IN LIMINE 1: Precluding any Evidence Relating to Plaintiff Engaging in
 23 Sexual Conduct Outside Heterosexual Marriage**

24 As touched upon in Plaintiff’s Opposition to Defendant’s Motion for Summary
 25 Judgment, Defendant sought to reframe its decision to revoke Plaintiff’s job offer as being
 26 based on her purported sexual conduct as opposed to her protected traits of sex (female), sexual
 27 orientation (gay), and marital status (being in a same-sex marriage). Dkt. No. 30. Defendant

1 alleged in its moving papers that “[n]either sexual conduct outside of biblical marriage, nor the
 2 class of those who promote it, is protected by Title VII,” Dkt. No. 26 at p. 13 (quotation and
 3 citation omitted), and further, “[World Vision] rescinded her offer because of her *sexual*
 4 *conduct outside biblical marriage* and such conduct (or its open promotion) required the same
 5 result regardless of gender (or [sexual] orientation).” Dkt. No. 26 at pp. 13-14 (citation
 6 omitted).

7 Relevance is the threshold evidentiary hurdle all admissible evidence must meet. *See,*
 8 *e.g.*, *Bultena v. Wash. State Dep’t of Agric.*, 319 F. Supp. 3d 1215, 1220 (E.D. Wash. 2018).
 9 Rule 401 of the Federal Rules of Evidence states that relevant evidence is evidence “having any
 10 tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the
 11 action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.” Fed. R. Evid.
 12 401; *Garcia v. Praxair, Inc.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-01493-SAB, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1329, at
 13 *19 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2021) (facts learned after deciding to take adverse employment action is
 14 not probative of whether the decision maker was aware of these facts when he or she made the
 15 decision). Here, nowhere in the record is there any evidence that Defendant asked Plaintiff,
 16 prior to rescinding its job offer to her, whether she was engaging in sexual conduct with her
 17 wife. All Defendant knew was that Plaintiff was in a same-sex marriage and she was having a
 18 baby. For all Defendant knew, Plaintiff and her wife were in a celibate, platonic marriage.
 19 Accordingly, Defendant should not be permitted to introduce any evidence at trial that Plaintiff
 20 was (or is) engaged in sexual conduct with her wife or any other person outside a heterosexual
 21 marriage.

22

23 **MOTION IN LIMINE 2: Precluding any Evidence Relating to the History of Plaintiff’s
 24 Sexual Identity and the Disclosures Made to Her Family as to
 25 Her Sexual Orientation**

26 During Plaintiff’s deposition, certain testimony was elicited as to Plaintiff’s personal
 27 journey regarding her sexual identity. These questions included: “I’d like to ask you some
 [questions] about how you came to decide that you are same-sex attracted as it were,” Tr. at

1 85:21-23, and “Can you take me back to the start of the journey where you came to that
 2 recognition [that you were a lesbian]?” Tr. at 86:2-8. There were also questions asked (and
 3 responses given) relating to disclosing to her family of her sexual orientation. One such
 4 question was: “So it sounds like there was a point where you told people, like your family, [of
 5 your sexual orientation] … is that right?” Tr. at 88:5-10. Further, another line of questioning
 6 elicited a response relating to how Plaintiff’s family reacted to the news of Plaintiff “coming
 7 out” and the lack of support initially extended by her family to her being gay. Tr. at 92:15-
 8 93:10.

9 Evidence is relevant if “it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it
 10 would be without the evidence.” Fed. R. Evid. 401(a). “The Court may exclude relevant
 11 evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of unfair prejudice,
 12 confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting
 13 cumulative evidence.” Fed. R. Evid. 403. However, “[i]rrelevant evidence is not admissible.”
 14 Fed. R. Evid. 402. Further, Rule 403 contemplates the preclusion of evidence that “‘appeals to
 15 emotion in ways that seem likely to overpower reason’ or evidence likely to be misused for an
 16 improper purpose.” *Mendez v. Reinforcing Ironworkers Union Local 416*, 2:09-CV-02332-
 17 LRH-NJK, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4068, at *6 (D. Nev. Jan. 7, 2013) (quoting 1 Christopher
 18 B. Mueller & Laird C. Kirkpatrick, Federal Evidence § 4:13 (3d ed. 2012)).

19 Here, testimony related to Plaintiff’s personal journey in coming to realize that she was
 20 gay is wholly irrelevant to any claim or defense in this matter. It is undisputed that at the time
 21 Plaintiff applied for the customer service position with World Vision, she identified as a
 22 “lesbian” or simply “gay.” Tr. at 91:11-19; 92:1-2. Any evidence as to how she understood her
 23 sexual identity or her personal journey to recognizing her sexual orientation (and that she was
 24 indeed gay) is irrelevant. Further, none of this information was known by Defendant at any
 25 time prior to Plaintiff’s deposition, which took place on February 24, 2023 (more than two
 26 years after her job offer had been revoked), and clearly played no role in Defendant’s decision
 27 relating to that revocation. This information also runs the risk of appealing to emotion or which

1 could be misused for an improper purpose. Plaintiff fears that information relating to her
 2 journey in understanding her sexual orientation could be weaponized by Defendant to exploit
 3 destructive stereotypes in hopes that it may resonate with jurors' potential biases. This, in and
 4 of itself, also warrants preclusion.

5 With respect to evidence relating to Plaintiff "coming out" to her family and her
 6 family's initial non-acceptance of her sexual orientation, such information is irrelevant in this
 7 matter. Defendant was never aware of this at any point and it played no role in its decision to
 8 rescind her job offer. Also, this subject matter can be very painful for an openly gay person to
 9 revisit, and unless unquestionably relevant (of which here there is no relevance), this further
 10 inures to preclusion.

11

12 **MOTION IN LIMINE 3: Precluding any Evidence Relating to Plaintiff Having**
Previously Suffered from an Eating Disorder

13

14 At Plaintiff's deposition, she was asked certain questions relating to a book she wrote
 15 called "Still I Rise," the contents of which included her struggles with an eating disorder.
 16 Specifically, Plaintiff testified that she struggled with an eating disorder in high school and
 17 then into college and as to the treatment she received as a result. Tr. at 58-60. Plaintiff also
 18 discussed the impact this had on her family (describing it as a "huge shock" when her family
 19 came to learn about it, Tr. at 61:1-6).

20 Plaintiff submits this information is also irrelevant to any claim or defense in this case
 21 and should be precluded. Further, to the extent that Defendant posits that it should be permitted
 22 to explore this subject matter as it potentially touches upon the causes of any emotional distress
 23 suffered by Plaintiff, such averment should be rejected as wholly speculative and lacking any
 24 evidentiary foundation. Plaintiff was indeed asked about whether and how the rescission of the
 25 job offer impacted her "health and wellbeing," Tr. at 250:19-25, however, Defendant did not
 26 inquire as to whether the emotional distress from which Plaintiff suffered (or from which she
 27 currently suffers) is instead attributable to an eating disorder she experienced in her youth. It's

1 unknown why Defendant didn't probe this topic. Further, Defendant could have sought
 2 Plaintiff to submit to an independent medical examination in order to discern the root(s) of any
 3 emotional distress, but instead chose not to. In any event, to suggest Plaintiff's emotional
 4 distress damages are the result of her eating disorder lacks any evidentiary foundation and any
 5 averment would be purely speculative. Lastly, this topic involves a very personal and sensitive
 6 subject matter which should be disallowed to be discussed at trial unless absolutely relevant and
 7 necessary, which isn't the circumstance here.

8

9 **MOTION IN LIMINE 4: Precluding any Evidence Relating to Plaintiff's Activism for**
 10 **LGBTQ Rights Including, Inter Alia, Her Involvement with**
 11 **the Charlotte Area Liberal Moms Group (Abbreviated CALM), Timeout Youth, or Selling Homemade Items Online**
that Contain Pro-LGBTQ Messaging

12 During Plaintiff's deposition, she was asked various questions regarding the activism
 13 by her and her wife in the LGBTQ community. In response, Plaintiff testified that she was
 14 involved in an organization in the Charlotte, North Carolina area called "Timeout Youth,"
 15 which is an organization that hosts kids after school and provides resources if somebody may
 16 be transgender or questioning one's sexual identity or sexuality. Plaintiff also explained that
 17 her wife volunteers for this organization in the summers. Tr. at 63:2-19. Further, Plaintiff
 18 stated that she and her wife stay active in the LGBTQ community including "attending the
 19 Charlotte Pride," Tr. at 63:17-19 (which is a festival celebrating LGBTQ rights) and being
 20 active in a group called Charlotte Area Liberal Moms (abbreviated CALM), which Plaintiff
 21 explained was an organization of "moms helping moms, but also supporting businesses that are
 22 LGBTQ friendly and inclusive." Tr. at 63:20-24.

23 Defendant also inquired as to Plaintiff selling homemade items online which contained
 24 pro-LGBTQ messaging. (Anecdotally, Plaintiff was also asked about selling homemade items
 25 containing positive messaging relating to overcoming eating disorders. Tr. at 70:11-17.)
 26 Insofar as is relevant, Plaintiff stated that she creates certain items including t-shirts and
 27

1 magnets containing, inter alia, the CALM insignia as well as a rainbow, which is the color
2 scheme associated with the LGBTQ community. Tr. at 73-77. Plaintiff notably also created a t-
3 shirt that has a quote on it that reads “Love is a terrible thing to hate” which includes a rainbow
4 on it. Tr. at 77:17-24.

5 This involvement by Plaintiff and her wife in the LGBTQ community is wholly
6 unrelated the adverse employment action taken by Defendant and is irrelevant to any claim or
7 defense in this action. There is absolutely no evidence that their involvement, either
8 individually or together, played any role in Defendant’s decision to rescind its job offer.
9 Furthermore, there is no evidence that World Vision was so much as even aware of Plaintiff’s
10 activism efforts or that she sold merchandise online with pro-LGBTQ messaging. In fact, this
11 only became known to Defendant at Plaintiff’s deposition. Rather, it is undisputed that
12 Plaintiff’s job offer was rescinded upon World Vision becoming aware that Plaintiff was in a
13 same-sex marriage. Further, allowing Defendant to delve into this subject matter runs the risk
14 of appealing to the emotions of jurors as to their feelings (and potential disagreement) on
15 LGBTQ rights issues and could be misused for the improper purpose of playing towards
16 destructive stereotypes. *See Mendez*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4068, at *6. As such, preclusion is
17 warranted.

18 **CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff requests that the Court order that Defendant be
20 precluded from introducing any evidence related to: (1) Plaintiff engaging in sexual conduct
21 with anyone; (2) Plaintiff’s history of her sexual identity and the disclosures made to her
22 family as to her sexual orientation; (3) Plaintiff having previously suffered from an eating
23 disorder; and (4) Plaintiff’s activism for LGBTQ rights including, inter alia, her involvement
24 with the Charlotte Area Liberal Moms group (abbreviated CALM), Timeout Youth, or selling
25 homemade items online that contain pro-LGBTQ messaging.

26 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of May 2023.

27 **NISAR LAW GROUP, P.C.**

1 By: /s/ Casimir Wolnowski
2 Casimir Wolnowski
3 One Grand Central Place
4 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4600
5 New York, New York 10165
6 Phone: (646) 889-1007
7 Fax: (516) 604-0157
8 Email : cwolnowski@nisarlaw.com
9 Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

10 **FRANK FREED SUBIT & THOMAS LLP**

11 By: /s/ Michael C. Subit
12 Michael C. Subit, WSBA No. 29189
13 705 Second Avenue, Suite 1200
14 Seattle, Washington 98104
15 Phone: (206) 682-6711
16 Fax: (206) 682-0401
17 Email: msubit@frankfreed.com

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*